REMARKS

The independent claims have been amended to state that the mixed layer is one "consisting essentially of" compounds (A) and (B) and the upper limit of the range of the ratio of (A) to (B) has been changed to 44.4, 55.6, based upon working example 2 on page 44 of the specification. Minor self-evident changes have been made in claims 2 to 4 and 17.

The withdrawal of claims 7 to 10 and 12 from consideration as reading upon non-elected species is acknowledged. The claims before the Examiner for consideration are claims 1 to 6, 11, and 13 to 18.

The rejection of claims 1 to 6, 11 and 15 to 18 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Hosokawa et al. '199 is respectfully traversed.

Although the reference shows hole transporting compounds and anthracene derivatives, there is no discussion anywhere in the specification of that reference with respect to control of the relationship of the energy gap of the hole transporting compound to the energy gap of the electron transporting compound. The instant specification in its discussion of prior art problems acknowledges that devices were prepared where the

energy gap of the hole transporting compound was greater than the energy gap of the electron transporting compound; see the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3. The problems associated with such a relationship are shown in the specification in Comparative Example 4; see pages 47 and 48.

Hosokawa et al. '199 also has no awareness of the need to control the ratio of the quantity of components (A) to (B) to achieve the objectives of the present invention. In this regard, the Examiner is directed to Comparative Examples 1 to 3 beginning at page 45 of the specification.

The disclosure in Hosokawa et al. '199 of various compounds that fall within the categories useful in the present invention does not and cannot lead to the present invention. The Examiner has suggested that the energy gap levels are "inherent" but this is clearly not so as seen from a review of Comparative Example 4 in the present case. The rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1 to 6, 11, 13, 14, 17, and 18 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Enokida et al. '531 in view of Inoue et al. '308 is also respectfully traversed. The independent claims (1 and 18) have been amended to recite that the layer of organic light emitting medium comprises a mixed

layer consisting essentially of the (A) and (B) materials. The change therefore excludes the presence of the polycarbonate in the layers of Enokida et al. '531, a reference that also does not teach, suggest or recognize the need for control of the energy gap levels as claimed herein. While Inoue et al. '108 describes a phenylanthracene derivative, the reference, as the primary reference, contains no discussion regarding the control of the energy gap levels as claimed herein and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully point out that the advantages of the present invention can be seen by comparing the efficiency of light emission values in Examples 2 to 4 of the present case (at least 4.02 cd/A, corresponding to 3.1 lm/W using the conversion equation of $\Pi \times 4.02$) with the light emission efficiency values of up to 1.75 lm/w in Table 4 of Enokida et al. '531. Note also that the half life time for Examples 2 to 4 is at least 2,900 hours, a significantly greater time than the half-lives of 1,000 or so hours in Enokida et al. '531.

To the extent that the values are deemed "inherent" the Examiner is referred to the comments presented above regarding Hosokawa et al. '199.

The rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Enokida et al. '531 in view of Inoue et al. '308, further in view of Hung et al. '623 is respectfully traversed. The tertiary reference, cited to show it is known in the art to provide a metal lithium fluoride layer in an electroluminescent device, does not overcome the shortcomings of the references discussed above and the rejection should be withdrawn as well.

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging that a certified copy of the priority document has been received.

In view of the foregoing revisions and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the case patentably defines over the cited art and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

December 3, 2003
Date

Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453

CAW/ch
Attorney Docket No.: OHTN:012

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street
Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220

PLEASE ACCEPT THIS AS AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT OR CREDIT FEES TO DEP. ACCT. 16-0331 PARKHURST & WENDEL